

REMARKS

Claims 1-18, 27, and 28 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 19-26 and 29-34 are cancelled without prejudice. With respect to claims 7 and 8, Applicants note that claim 1 and other claims are linking claims. Similarly, with respect to claims 16 and 17, claim 12 and other claims are linking claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request examination of claims 7, 8, 16 and 17 upon allowance of the linking claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that, "the use of the trademark [0035] and [0036] has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized whenever it appears...." Applicant assumes the Examiner is referring to the trademarks listed in paragraphs 0035 and 0036 of the published application. Applicant has capitalized all of the trademarks listed in paragraphs 0035 and 0036. Applicant has also capitalized other trademarks listed in the application.

Restriction Requirement Under 35 U.S.C. § 121

The Examiner imposed a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121, and indicated that restriction to one of the following inventions was required: Group I (claims 1-6, 9-15, 18, 27 and 28); Group II (claims 19-26); or Group III (claims 7-8, 16-17, 29-31 and 32-34). Applicants confirm without traverse the provisional election made during a telephone conference on March 16, 2005, to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-6, 9-15, 18, 27 and 28. Claims 19-26, 29-31 and 32-34 have been cancelled without prejudice. Furthermore, Applicants have noted that claims 7, 8, 16 and 17 are related to linking claims in Group I. Therefore, Applicants believe that claims 7, 8, 16 and 17 should be examined upon the allowance of corresponding linking claims.

Double Patenting Rejections

The Examiner provisionally rejected claim 1 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of co-pending applications 10/772,068 and 10/749,164. Applicants have included Terminal Disclaimers in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321 (c) to overcome the rejections under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian L. Jarrells
Registration No. 53,067

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuent, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 252-1535